

JAN 05 2007

Appln. No. 10/016,585  
Amendment dated January 3, 2007  
Reply to Office Action mailed August 22, 2006

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 7, 12 through 19, 21 through 27 and 29 remain in this application. Claims 2 through 6, 8 through 11, 20 and 28 have been cancelled. No claims have been withdrawn or added.

The Examiner's rejections will be considered in the order of their occurrence in the Office Action.

**Paragraphs 1 through 9 of the Office Action**

Claims 1, 7, 21, 22, 24, 25 and 29 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ezekiel in view of Richardson.

Claim 27 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ezekiel, Richardson and Fuji.

Claim 26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ezekiel, Richardson and Goldman.

Claim 23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ezekiel, Richardson and Matheny.

Claim 1 requires, in part, "wherein the new application or applet is launched as a result of navigating to a web page" and similarly, claim 7 requires "wherein the applications or applets are launched as a result of navigating to a web page".

With respect to these requirements of the claims, it is conceded in the rejection of the Office Action that:

Ezekiel does not teach that the new application is launched as a result of navigating a web page.

Appln. No. 10/016,585  
Amendment dated January 3, 2007  
Reply to Office Action mailed August 22, 2006

It is then alleged that:

However, such feature is known in the art as taught by Richardson. Richardson teaches a system for guided touring of websites (col 2, lines 9) and further teaches launching a new application as a result of navigating to a web page (application to render media) (col 2, lines 9-27; col 4, lines 27-57).

Turning to the referenced portions of the Richardson patent, it is stated at col. 2, lines 9 through 27 that:

The present invention further includes a media rendering function also programmed onto the web server for rendering on the client system, one or more corresponding media for each of the one or more web sites, for at least a portion of the time while a web site is connected to the client system.

Additionally, for one embodiment, the present invention further includes a navigator also programmed onto the web server for facilitating dynamic user modification by a user of the client system to the connection of the client system to the one or more web sites, such as temporarily stopping and resuming the connection, and/or shortening a particular connection, and skipping forward or backward, to the immediate following or preceding one, or any particular unvisited or visited one of the one or more web sites. The media rendering function and the web tour director cooperate with each other to ensure the media are rendered in concert with the connections being made; and the media rendering function is implemented as an integral part of the navigator.

Keeping in mind that the claims require that "the new application or applet is launched as a result of navigating to a web page", it is submitted that nothing in this portion of the Richardson patent leads one of ordinary skill in the art to understand that any application or applet is launched *as a result of* navigating to a web page. More specifically, it is submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would more likely understand that the Richardson system involves an application that is already operative prior to the navigation to the web page. It is submitted that this distinction becomes more clear when one considers the other portion of the Richardson patent that is relied upon in the rejection, at col. 4, lines 27 through 57, where it is stated that (emphasis added):

Appln. No. 10/016,585  
Amendment dated January 3, 2007  
Reply to Office Action mailed August 22, 2006

As shown, for the illustrated embodiment, guided touring of websites 16 in accordance with the present invention starts with the user of web touring station 12 connecting web touring station 12 to a tour operator website, preferably (but not necessarily) a website 16 incorporated with the teachings of the present invention, step 22. In response, tour operator website provides user with a directory of available guided tours, step 24. User then selects one of the available guided tours, step 26. In response, tour operator provides user with a web tour viewer of the present invention accompanied with a definition of the tour stops (i.e. websites) for the selected tour, and corresponding media complements for the tour stops, step 28. Web tour viewer then connects web touring station 12 to the tour stops in accordance with the tour stop definition, and renders the corresponding media complements at each of the tour stops, step 30.

Steps 24 and 26 are optional. It is expected that the present invention may be practiced by tour operators, each providing only a single guided tour. For these tour operators, they may go straight to step 28. Rendering of media complements at tour stops is also optional. However, as will be appreciated by those skilled in the art, rendering of media complements at tour stops is highly desirable, as it significantly enriches the touring experience of the user taking the tour. Preferably, the media complements should be multi-media, e.g. including audio as well as video and/or animation. Stopping at multiple tour stops is also optional. The present invention may be practiced by tour operators providing single-stop tours, however, it is anticipated that the tour operator will be providing significant multi-media complement to the information available from the single tour stop.

It is submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art, considering this portion of the Richardson patent, would understand that it is not any navigation to a web page that initiates the web tour viewer of the Richardson system, but instead the user's "select[ion of] one of the available guided tours" (see, for example, the depiction of the tour options in Figure 3 of the drawings of Richardson) that causes the web tour viewer to be provided to the user. It is therefore submitted that the Richardson patent does not disclose a "new application or applet is launched as a result of navigating to a web page" as required by claim 1, and similarly by claim 7.

Appln. No. 10/016,585  
Amendment dated January 3, 2007  
Reply to Office Action mailed August 22, 2006

It is further contended in the rejection of the Office Action that:

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Ezekiel and Richardson before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the interface reconstruction method taught by Ezekiel to include launching the new application as a result of navigating a web page taught by Richardson with the motivation being to enable the users of Ezekiel's system to locate and view information on the Internet (Richardson, col 1, lines 5-9).

Aside from the Richardson patent not disclosing "launching the new application as a result of navigating a web page" as discussed above, it is submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to include the selected features of the Richardson system into the Ezekiel system in the manner suggested in the rejection. The portion of the Richardson patent states relied upon in this portion of the rejection (at col. 1, lines 5 through 9 of Richardson) states that:

The present invention relates to the field of Internet/Intranet. More specifically, the present invention relates to the methodologies and tools for a user to locate and view information on the Internet or any Intranet.

However, nothing here indicates that the selected elements of the Richardson system "*enable[s]* the users of Ezekiel's system [or one with a similar function] to locate and view information on the Internet" as alleged in the rejection, merely that the Richardson system *relates* to these functions. As the Ezekiel system is directed to "dynamic menu construction in a graphical user interface", it is not understood how one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to adopt features of the Richardson guided web tour system into a system that is simply concerned with constructing dynamic menus. It is submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to incorporate the selected elements of Richardson into Ezekiel for the stated (or any other) reason, unless one had knowledge of the applicant's disclosure.

It is therefore submitted that the cited patents, and especially the allegedly obvious combination of Ezekiel, Richardson, Fuji, Goldman and

JAN 05 2007

Appln. No. 10/016,585  
Amendment dated January 3, 2007  
Reply to Office Action mailed August 22, 2006

Matheny set forth in the rejections of the Office Action, would not lead one skilled in the art to the applicant's invention as required by claims 1 and 7. Further, claims 21 through 24, which depend from claim 1, and claims 25 through 27 and 29, which depend from claim 7, also include the requirements discussed above and therefore are also submitted to be in condition for allowance.

Withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection of claims 1, 7, 21, 22 through 27, and 29 is therefore respectfully requested.

### CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, early reconsideration and allowance of this application are most courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

WOODS, FULLER, SHULTZ & SMITH P.C.



Jeffrey A. Proehl (Reg. No. 35,987)  
Customer No. 40,158  
P.O. Box 5027  
Sioux Falls, SD 57117-5027  
(605)336-3890 FAX (605)339-3357

Date: Jan 5, 2007